

## REMARKS

### *Claims*

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-13, 15, 16, 18 and 21-41 and objected to claims 7, 8, 14, 17, 19 and 20. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended by the addition of subject matter from former claims 5 and 6. Former claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 7-41 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation from former claim 5 that the ratio of the refractive index of the diffuser particles to the refractive index of the core equals  $1 + \mu$ , and that  $\mu$  has variance over a wavelength range of the one or more light sources specified in claim 1. Claim 1 further includes a range limitation for the value of  $|\mu|$ , namely that  $0.010 \leq |\mu| < 0.035$  at the average wavelength of the one or more light sources. Basis for these amendments can be found, for example, in claims 5 and 6 and in the second paragraph on page 17 of the specification.

With reference to page 2 of the Office Action, claim 33 has been amended to include a period (.) at the end of the claim. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to remove terms that could be construed as being indefinite and Claim 15 has been amended for clarity. The dependencies of Claims 7, 8, 18 and 19 have been amended in view of the cancellation of claims 5 and 6.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102*

With reference to page 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 16, 21-23, 33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,117,472 to Blyler Jr. et al.

As the Examiner acknowledges in the first paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, Blyler Jr. et al. teaches a value of  $\mu = 0.0096$ . The Applicant notes that the paragraph spanning columns 4 and 5 of Blyler Jr. et al. also teaches a value of  $\mu = 0.0439$ . However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Blyler Jr. et al. that  $0.010 \leq |\mu| < 0.035$  at the average wavelength of the one or more light sources as specified in amended Claim 1. In contrast, Blyler Jr. et al. teaches a value of  $\mu$  outside both ends of the range specified in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 and the remaining claims dependent thereon cannot be anticipated by Blyler Jr. et al. alone.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103*

With reference to page 3-6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 11-13, 15, 18, 24-32, 34-37 and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blyler Jr. et al. or unpatentable over Blyler Jr. et al. in view of U S Patent 4,466,697 to Daniel.

Daniel makes no disclosure or suggestion of the range of  $|\mu|$  specified in amended Claim 1. With reference to the foregoing, since Blyler Jr. et al. also fails to teach or suggest the range specified for  $|\mu|$  as recited in Claim 1, the combination of Blyler Jr. et al. and Daniel cannot render the present invention as recited in Claim 1 obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

With reference to paragraph 8 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that none of the relevant prior art teaches or suggests the particular values for  $\mu$  recited in claims 7 and 8, namely  $\mu = 0.018$  and  $0.011$  at a wavelength of 568nm. However, in light of the range of values recited for  $\mu$  in the specification, namely  $< 0.035$  as recited, for example, in former Claim 6 and  $\geq 0.010$  as recited, for example, in the second paragraph on page 17 of the specification, the Applicant is entitled to specify a range for the value of  $\mu$  to adequately protect their invention as supported by the

Appl. No. 10/528,319  
Amdt Dated December 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2006


specification. The Applicant is also entitled to specify an average wavelength in Claim 1 as supported by the specification and to further particularize the wavelength as recited in Claims 7 and 8

*Conclusion*

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that Claim 1 and Claims 2-4 and 7-41 dependent thereon are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art of record and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited

Respectfully submitted,

BUCKINGHAM, DOOLITTLE & BURROUGHS, LLP



By: Brent L. Moore, Registration No 42,902

By: David P Dureska, Registration No 34,152

BLM/cam

4518 Fulton Drive, N.W.  
P. O. Box 35548  
Canton, OH 44735-5548  
Telephone: (330) 491-5333  
Facsimile: (330) 252-5376  
E-Mail: Bmoore@bdblaw.com  
Attorney Docket No.: FISHER-F (51373 0015)

«CI2:527907\_v1»